

**Village of Cold Spring
Historic District Review Board
85 Main Street, Cold Spring, New York 10516
Workshop: Deliberation on Butterfield Redevelopment Application Public Comment**

May 7, 2015

Members Present: Chair Al Zgolinski; Vice Chair Kathleen E. Foley; Members: Carolyn C. Bachan, Peter Downey and Michael Junjulas

Present for the Applicant: Paul Guillaro, property owner; Matt Moran, Unicorn Construction; Ray Sullivan; Project Architect.

Chairman A. Zgolinski opened the meeting at 8:09pm. He noted that the Interim Village Attorney had cancelled his attendance at this meeting and had not prepared a resolution for the Board to review as agreed at the 4/22/15 public hearing. The Board agreed that it would not work on drafting a resolution for the Butterfield proposal without the Village Attorney being present. Mr. Florence will deliver a resolution electronically at a later date.

The Applicant had been asked to provide information for questions raised by members of the public in the 4/22/15 hearing. The Applicant presented the Board with a drawing of the proposed garage door on building six,. The door will normally be in the closed position, and will open automatically with a key fob held by residents; it will be lit by a pole lamp, not a light attached to the building. There is no pedestrian exit from the building out of the garage, only stairwells at the north end which lead up into the building.

The Chair requested the following revisions of the applicant after discussion with the Board:

- To replace the cementitious panels between windows on Buildings 1 & 2 with metal panels
- The submission of the garage door located on the façade of Building 6
- Where various types of PVC materials are currently indicated; all shall be AZEK and drawings should reflect this change
- Guard rail should be changed to stone or some kind of wood.

The Vice Chair had asked for a complete listing of the land coverage of each building on the site, in square feet. Mr. Moran read these out. The Applicant reviewed the square foot dimensions of the proposed buildings as previously requested.

K. Foley noted that great progress had been made in terms of design modifications and that the commercial structures and single family homes seemed to reflect the character of the surrounding Historic District. However, she expressed a great deal of concern over the mass and scale of the multi-family residences, and particularly the size of Buildings 4,5, & 6, which with their single foundation and garage seem actually to be one massive structure that is incompatible with the District. She read out a comparison of land coverages for Building 3 and Building 4,5,6 with other structures in the Village, noting that they are much larger than other multi-family housing, Philipstown Town Hall and Village

shopping plaza structures, and comparable only to the existing hospital and the Haldane school buildings.

P. Downey interjected that it is too late to bring up mass and scale, and that should have been addressed a long time ago. Foley noted that Board issues around mass and scale were addressed at several stages of review, but the mass and scale of the application in its current configuration could not be addressed until very recently. Representations of the buildings in relationship to each other were only made available right before and at the 4/22/15 public hearing and the mass model was only delivered a few days before the public hearing. The Board in fact had not yet had any substantive discussions of the projects' mass and scale.

C. Bachan also expressed concern over the mass and scale of the multi-family homes. She additionally felt that the lots allocated for the single family homes were too small given the size of the proposed homes. She felt that the site plan does not maximize the potential of the project. She expressed frustration over the constraints that the B4A legislation placed on the HDRB to make real and effective modifications to the plan.

M. Junjulas felt that the designs for the buildings on the site fit well with the surrounding district and that the Applicant had made many design compromises to meet the requests of the HDRB.

After an extended discussion, the Board debated the format for the resolution that the Interim Village Attorney will draft, and concluded that a single resolution, rather than one addressing site plan and then design elements, would best suit needs. The Applicant voiced his support for a single resolution for the whole project.

The Board will review the draft resolution electronically, then meet on Thursday, May 14, 2015 at 8:00pm for final discussion and vote.

Other Business:

- The Board reviewed a requested change to the CLG RFP wording by the Village Attorney.
- The Board reviewed the invoice submitted by the Interim Village Attorney as requested by the Village Treasurer. There were some questions about the amount of time spent on certain tasks, as well as the dates of some services; the Vice Chair will take those questions to the Treasurer for followup.

P. Downey moved to adjourn the meeting; C. Bachan seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 9:55 P.M.